

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MARCOS L.

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN O'MALLEY,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01882-CDS-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 10]

Pending before the Court is an unopposed motion for extension of time for Plaintiff to file his opening brief. Docket No. 10. Plaintiff seeks a 46-day extension premised on an assertion that counsel needs more time given competing work obligations and caseload. *See id.* at 1-2 (noting that in the next month “staff in Counsel’s office have one hundred and twenty-three (123) Plaintiff briefs due”). Such an assertion lacks important detail, including which attorney is handling this matter and why *that attorney* cannot meet the current deadline. Moreover, that an attorney has overloaded himself is not good cause for an extension, *see, e.g., Olesczuk v. Citizens One Home Loans*, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at *6 n.3 (D. Nev. Nov. 4, 2016) (citing *Greene v. Alhambra Hosp. Med. Ctr.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 72697, at *3 (D. Nev. June 3, 2015)), which the Court has explained to the Commissioner’s attorneys when they have asked for extensions based on the same reasoning, *see, e.g., Fenwick v. Kijakazi*, No. 2:22-cv-01077-NJK, *Burright v. Kijakazi*, No. 2:21-cv-01288-NJK, Docket No. 25 (D. Nev. Mar. 22, 2022); *Ramirez v. Saul*, Case No. 2:19-cv-00978-NJK, Docket No. 21 (D. Nev. Oct. 16, 2019); *Gonzalez v. Berryhill*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02199-APG-NJK, Docket No. 16 (D. Nev. Apr. 16, 2019); *Betten v. Berryhill*, Case No. 2:18-cv-00536-KJD-NJK, Docket No. 24 (D. Nev. Dec. 06, 2018). In short, good cause has not been shown for the extension requested.

1 As a one-time courtesy to counsel, however, the Court will allow an extension.
2 Accordingly, the motion to extend is **GRANTED** and the deadline for the responsive brief is
3 **EXTENDED** to April 1, 2024. Docket No. 10.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: February 6, 2024

6
7 
8 _____
9 Nancy J. Koppe
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28